

Attorney's Docket No. 09/914,214Application No. 030673-127

Page 5

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application is respectfully requested.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1-2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,977,679, hereinafter Miller.

Miller discloses a pole phase modulated toroidal winding for an induction machine having a stator 10 with a stator core 12. A plurality of coils 14 are provided on the stator core 12. Figure 3 is an enlarged view of a portion of the stator core 12. In the Official Action, the Examiner equated the teeth between the slots in Miller to the cogs claimed in the present invention. As indicated in column 3, lines 5-6, of Miller, the number of inner slots 26 (i.e., teeth or cogs) is a multiple of the number of outer slots 28. See also Figure 3. Accordingly, the number inner teeth does not equal the number of outer teeth.

In contrast to the teachings of Miller, in the present invention, the number of cogs formed on the inner circumference of the stator rings is the same as the number of cogs formed on the outer circumference thereof. See, e.g., page 7, lines 20-22. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include this feature.

According to the present invention, both the inner and outer poles are active, i.e., they contribute to the motor torque. In contrast, in Miller, only the inner poles are active, while the outer tabs 30 have a different role. Accordingly, in view of the difference in structure and operation of the present invention, as exemplified by the foregoing amendments to claim 1, claim 1 should now be patentable over Miller.

Attorney's Docket No. 09/914,214Application No. 030673-127

Page 6

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and is thus also patentable over Miller at least for the reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 3 and 4 have been indicated as including allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form without including the foregoing amendments to claim 1.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 3, and are thus also patentable, as indicated by the Examiner.

Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, in view of Danilevich. However, Danilevich does not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of claim 1 based on Miller. Accordingly, claims 6 and 7 are patentable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 17, 2003

By:



William C. Rowland

Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Attorney's Docket No. 09/914.214Application No. 030673-127

Page 7

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Fax. No. (703) 305-3432 on June 17, 2003.

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

Date: June 17, 2003

FAX RECEIVED

JUN 17 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800